

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1-20 are pending. Claim 1 is amended. New dependent claims 11-20 are submitted.

In response to the Office Action, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 as anticipated by Tischer. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 were rejected as anticipated by Christiansen. Claims 6-10 were allowed.

The indication of allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. For the reasons set forth in detail below, it is submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 is amended to recite the feature in which the pressure reflecting device includes first and second pressure difference detecting passages which respectively extend from first and second locations along the connecting passage (i.e., the connecting passage connecting the control valve and the fluid pressure device) and the control valve. Claim 1 is further amended to recite that the first and second locations are along the connecting passage and located between the control valve and the fluid pressure device. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious the features of claim 1.

With respect to Tischer, the Office Action points to the passage 5 as a connecting passage to a fluid pressure device 13. However, the line 5 is a pilot line from which a line having a constant throttle 6 branches off from the pressure delivery line 3, and line 18 extends from the branched-off portion to the flow-dividing valve 21. The flow-dividing valve 21 is also provided with an additional control line 22. See col. 3, lines 40-48 and col. 5, lines 7-17. As should be readily apparent, the line 18 does not extend from a connecting passage which connects a control valve and a fluid pressure device and does not extend from

a location along the connecting passage between the control valve and the fluid pressure device, but rather, the line 18 extends from a line which is branched-off from the pressure delivery line 3 and which is separated by a constant throttle 6. It is respectfully submitted that Tischer does not disclose or suggest a pressure difference reflecting device as set forth in claim 1, and Tischer particularly fails to disclose or suggest an arrangement in which first and second pressure difference detecting passages extend from first and second locations along a connecting passage (connecting a control valve to a fluid pressure device), with each of the first and second locations along the connecting passage and between control valve and the fluid pressure device.

Christiansen also fails to disclose or suggest the features set forth in claim 1. The Office Action refers to lines or passages 27, 29 as a pressure difference reflecting device. However, with the Christiansen arrangement, the desire is simply to insure that a pressure signal PS is fed to a control input 27, and represents a mixed function composed of the load pressure PB and a compensating pressure PK provided by conduit 18. The compensating pressure PK is introduced by control input 29, and with this arrangement, the compensating pressure is always larger than the signal PS by a constant value predetermined by the spring 28. Col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 12. Christiansen clearly fails to disclose or suggest a pressure difference reflecting device as set forth in claim 1. Christiansen fails to disclose or suggest first and second pressure difference detecting passages extending from first and second locations, with the first and second locations between the control valve and the fluid pressure device along a connecting passage which connects the control valve and the fluid pressure device. Accordingly, it is submitted that Christiansen also fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or render obvious the features of claim 1. Further, since the cited references are directed toward

different purposes and objectives, it is submitted that one skilled in the art would not modify the teachings of the cited references to arrive at the present invention.


The present dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons for which claim 1 is allowable. In addition, it is submitted that the present dependent claims include numerous features that are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, particularly in combination with the features of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, he is encouraged to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)